REMARKS

SUMMARY

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-40, and 42-44 were rejected by the Examiner. In response, Applicants now amend claims 1, 3, 16-17, 31, and 38-39, and cancel claims 2, 4, and 34. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-33, 35-40, and 42-44 remain pending in the Application.

DOUBLE–PATENTING

1. In "Double Patenting," item 9 on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-40, and 42-44 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-22, 24-30, 33, 35-38, 41-63, 66-75, 77-80, 83 and 84 of copending Application No. 10/082,807 (hereinafter '807) which was filed on the same day as the instant application and is owned by the same entity.

Applicants will, upon issuance of either '807 or the instant application, submit the necessary Terminal Disclaimer for the remaining application. Thus, there will be no double patenting.

2. In "Double Patenting" item 10 on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-4, 10, 12, 15-17, 22, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, and 44 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-8, 19-23, 26, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 43, and 44 of copending Application No. 10/784,492 (hereinafter '492) which was filed after the instant application.

Applicants will, upon issuance of either '492 or the instant application, submit the necessary Terminal Disclaimer for the remaining application. Thus, there will be no double patenting.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C-. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102," item 12 on page 8 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 4, 10, 38, 39, and 44 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by "Using WebLogic Enterprise JavaBeans" by BEA Systems (hereinafter "WebLogic") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejection of claim 4 is obviated by its cancellation.

Amended claim 1 teaches a "method of specifying a stateful web service comprising:

first facilitating, by an integrated development environment of a computing device, a user in providing a source code representation of at least a portion of web service logic, the logic including one or more methods;

second facilitating, by the integrated development environment of the computing device, the user in identifying one of said one or more methods to be exposed as part of the stateful web service; and

in response to user input, automatically specifying, by the integrated development environment of the computing device, one or more declarative annotations within the source code representation, the declarative annotations, when recognized by a compiler through analysis of the web service logic which includes the declarative annotations, causing the compiler to generate one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to the identified method."

In contrast, WebLogic fails to teach an integrated development environment that, in response to user input, automatically specifies declarative annotations within the source code representation, the declarative annotations, when recognized by a compiler through analysis of the web service logic which includes the declarative annotations, causing the compiler to generate one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to the identified method.

Rather, WebLogic simply teaches a framework for the development and deployment of EJBeans. In WebLogic, a user/developer may either obtain or program/specify EJBeans,

which may include business logic to perform a number of methods. WebLogic further teaches that the developer may create a "deployment descriptor." which WebLogic teaches to be generated by a "DDCreator" application of the WebLogic framework from a text file. The deployment descriptor accompanies an EJBean and defines implementation specific parameters for the EJBean. EJBeans and their deployment descriptors are then deployed within the WebLogic framework and compiled. To generate class files of the EJBean, a framework user inputs a command line instruction that includes a reference to the deployment descriptor. The deployment descriptor is then used in the generation of the class files.

Even assuming for the sake of argument that the class files are "one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to the identified method" (a point with which Applicants disagree), WebLogic still does not disclose, expressly or inherently the the deployment descriptor is specified within the EJBean source code. In fact, the generation of the deployment descriptor from a text file by the DDCreator seems to teach away from including the deployment descriptor within the source code. Further, from its independent filepath and invocation on page 6 of WebLogic, it appears that the deployment descriptor is intended to be its own separate file to be used in conjunction with the EJBean source code.

Also, WebLogic does not teach that the compiler recognizes the declarative annotations through analysis of the web service logic which includes the declarative annotations, as is recited in claim 1. According to WebLogic, on page 6, that deployment descriptor is recognized by the compiler in response to the specification of its filepath by the user in a command line. No analysis is needed by the compiler to discover whether or not there are declarative annotations (deployment descriptor) since the deployment descriptor is its own file, and the location of that file is provided to the compiler.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by WebLogic under §102.

Claim 38 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is directed to an article of manufacture having instructions for computing systems to implement a compiler performing operations on the web service logic, source code, and declarative annotations specified by the integrated development environment of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 38 is patentable over WebLogic for at least the same reasons.

Claims 4, 10, 39, and 44 depend from amended claims 1 and 38, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Acordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 4, 10, 39, and 44 are not anticipated by WebLogic under §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 14 on page 12 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 2 and 3 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "EJBDoclet," December 21, 2000, by dreamBean Software (hereinafter "EJBDoclet").

The rejection of claim 2 is obviated by its cancellation.

EJBDoclet does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claim 1 remains patentable over WebLogic and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 3 depends from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable over WebLogic and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

2. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 15 on page 13 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 5-8, 18, and 40 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of "Enterprise JavaBeans" by Monson-Haefel (hereinafter "Monson-Haefel").

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 38 remain patentable over WebLogic and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination,

for at least the reasons given above. Claims 5-8, 18, and 40 depend from claims 1, 16, and 38, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 5-8, 18, and 40 are patentable over WebLogic and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

3. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 16 on page 15 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 9, 16, 17, and 41 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of prior art of record U.S. Patent 5,812,768 to Pagé, et al. (hereinafter "Pagé").

Applicants respectfully note that claim 41 was cancelled in the previous response.

Claim 16 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is directed to computing systems having a compiler performing operations on the web service logic, source code, and declarative annotations specified by the integrated development environment of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable over WebLogic for at least the same reasons.

Pagé does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1 and 16 remain patentable over WebLogic and Pagé, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 9 and 17 depend from claims 1 and 16, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are patentable over WebLogic and Pagé, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

4. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 17 on page 17 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12, 31 and 34 have been rejected as being unpatentble over WebLogic as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,230,160 to Chan, et al. (hereinafter "Chan").

The rejection of claim 34 is obviated by its cancellation.

Amended claim 31 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1, and thus is patentable over WebLogic for at least the reasons given above.

Chan does not cure the deficiences of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1 and 31 remain patentable over WebLogic and Chan, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 12 depends from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentable over WebLogic and Chan, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

5. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 18 on page 19 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 13, 20 and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the "Background of the Invention" section appearing on pages 1-3 of the originally filed specification (hereinafter "BOTI").

BOTI does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 38 remain patentable over WebLogic and BOTI, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 13, 20 and 42 depend from claims 1, 16, and 38, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 13, 20 and 42 are patentable over WebLogic and BOTI, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

6. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 19 on page 19 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 14 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and BOTI as applied to claims 13, 20 and 42 above, and further in view of Pagé.

Pagé does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 13 remains patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 14 depends from claim 13, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 14 is patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

7. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 20 on page 20 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 15, 21, and 43 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and BOTI as applied to claims 13, 20 and 42 above, and further in view of Monson-Haefel.

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and BOTI. Accordingly, claims 13, 20, and 42 remain patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 15, 21, and 43 depend from claims 13, 20, and 42, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claim 15, 21, and 43 are patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

8. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 21 on page 20 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 32 and 33 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and Chan as applied to claims 31 above, and in further view of EJBDoclet.

EJBDoclet does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and Chan. Accordingly, claim 31 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 32-33 depend from claim 31, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claims 32-33 are patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

9. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 22 on page 21 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 35 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and Chan as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of BOTI.

BOTI does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and Chan. Accordingly, claim 31 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 35 depends from claim 31, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

10. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 23 on page 21 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 36 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic, Chan and BOTI above, and in further view of Pagé.

Pagé does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 35 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 36 depends from claim 35, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 36 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

11. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 24 on page 21 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 37 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Monson-Haefel.

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 35 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 37 depends from claim 35, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 37 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-33, 35-40, and 42-44 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-33, 35-40, and 42-44 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance if respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: June 18, 2007 by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981